



Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

WP 5 - Project assurance and efficiency (Quality Plan)

INTERNAL EVALUATIONS OF INVENT PROJECT

CRE.THI.DEV.

September 2018



Erasmus+

Page 1 of 10





Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

Document Data

Distribution List	CO (Confidential, only for members of the Consortium (including the Commission Services))
Document Version	0.1
Reviewed by	
Review Date	

Version	Date	Author/Organization
0.1	19 September 2018	Maya Dimitriadou / CRE.THI.DEV

Disclaimer

This project has been funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union.

The information and views set out in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the European Union. Neither the European Union institutions and bodies nor any person acting on their behalf may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

Copyright © INVENT Consortium, 2015-2018





Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

Table of Contents

1	Executive Summary	4
2	Introduction.....	4
3	Objectives of the Deliverable	4
4	Methodology	5
5	Results	5
6	Conclusions.....	8
7	Annexes	8
	Annex I : QF-PQA(1.0):Project Quality Assessment Questionnaire	9



Erasmus+



Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

1 Executive Summary

In the scope of the INVENT project, and particularly according to what is foreseen in the WP5 Project assurance and efficiency, this report contains the results of the internal evaluations of the project that were conducted two times during its lifetime and at the end of the project, according to what is foreseen in the Quality Plan Manual.

All questions included in the questionnaire scored above the acceptance limit of 75% satisfaction, which means that no corrective action was necessary.

2 Introduction

The quality of the project processes has been done through self-evaluation of the consortium by the project partners themselves, using the Project Quality Assessment Form QF-PQA (Annex I). For the evaluation of the project as a whole, a set of indicators have been established, which can be measured on a scale from 1 to 5, where 5 is very positive and 1 is very negative. The indicators are generally relevant to the quality of the project management, coordination, structure, support mechanisms, content, and resources.

The evaluation was primarily done by each partner, who answered twenty questions with an assessment of the performance of the consortium. The QM collected all the answers, which reflected the views of the consortium on its progress, from the partners and assessed them, according to part 4, Methodology. In case the QM, upon processing the results found that the results of the answers to one or more questions were below the expected performance, informed the PC in order to set forth problem-solving procedures.

The evaluation has been performed three times, during the lifecycle of the project.

3 Objectives of the Deliverable

The questionnaire (QF-PQA(1.0)) that was used for the internal evaluation of the project consisted of 20 questions that referred to the project quality in general. The deliverable is a table, where the comparison between the three (3) internal quality assessments is presented, in terms of % of satisfaction as described in part 4, Methodology.

The objective of internal evaluation was to assess different aspects of the project progress and lead to corrective actions, by the Project Coordinator, if it deemed necessary.







Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

4 Methodology

The project quality assessment questionnaires consisted of questions that could be answered with the aid of a five points rating scale where 1 is poor and 5 is very good

The elaboration of the answers to the questionnaires was made by CRE.THI.DEV, with the use of excel, and the results have been sent, each time, to the project coordinator and presented during the project meetings.

The formula for the evaluation of results was the following:

$$[(1a + 2b + 3c + 4d + 5e)/5 (a+b+c+d+e)] \%$$

Where:

a, b, c, d, and e are the numbers of questionnaires that rated the activity with 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 respectively.

The activity was considered successful if the percentage of satisfaction was more than 75%. In case the percentage of satisfaction was less than 75%, CRE.THI.DEV would propose proper corrective actions which should be agreed with the Project Coordinator.

All partners had access to the questionnaire through google forms.

5 Results

In the 1st evaluation, 12 answered questionnaires were received.

In the 2nd evaluation, 11 answered questionnaires were received

In the final evaluation, 16 answered questionnaires were received

All questions showed a percentage of satisfaction over 75% (which is the limit, under which corrective actions are needed).

In the following table the 20 questions and their evaluation are presented.

INTERNAL EVALUATIONS OF INVENT PROJECT				
(Percentage of satisfaction)				
	How do you evaluate....	1 st internal evaluation	2 nd internal evaluation	3 rd internal evaluation
1.	The extent to which the consortium commits time and	93,3	95,0	92,5







Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

INTERNAL EVALUATIONS OF INVENT PROJECT				
(Percentage of satisfaction)				
	How do you evaluate....	1st internal evaluation	2nd internal evaluation	3rd internal evaluation
	resources as required by the Work Plan?			
2.	The consortium's efficiency to resolve problems?	96,7	94,0	92,5
3.	The effectiveness and clarity of the communication among the partners and the Project Coordinator?	86,7	91,7	90,0
4.	The effectiveness and clarity of communication with other agencies eg. the National Agency, EEA Grants Managing Authority?	85,5	81,7	90,0
5.	The commitment and proportionate involvement of all partners?	76,7	88,3	87,5
6.	The arrangements for the implementation of the work packages and the administration of budgets?	90,0	95,0	91,3
7.	The effectiveness of the project co-ordination?	93,3	96,7	86,3
8.	The professional competence and commitment displayed by the PC?	95,0	95,0	90,0
9.	The quality of the relationship among the partners and team-development?	91,7	88,3	88,2
10.	The quality of the project monitoring and evaluation processes?	93,3	93,3	92,5
11.	The quality of the project information/results dissemination	90,0	93,3	91,3







Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

INTERNAL EVALUATIONS OF INVENT PROJECT				
(Percentage of satisfaction)				
	How do you evaluate....	1st internal evaluation	2nd internal evaluation	3rd internal evaluation
	arrangements?			
12.	The adherence to the Work Plan by all partners?	83,3	81,7	87,5
13.	The deviations from the Work Plan? If any, were they based on well-considered reasons and mutual agreement?	83,3	91,7	90,0
14.	The quality of the project in terms of its short, medium and long term impact at local/regional/national/European level?	86,7	93,3	95,0
15.	The quality of materials/guides/reports/products throughout the life-cycle of the project?	91,7	88,3	88,8
16.	The support from within your partner organization, in terms of managerial support, specialized support or peer support?	86,7	98,3	93,8
17.	The sufficiency, range and suitability of project resources, including, where appropriate, technology resources?	88,3	88,3	87,5
18.	The sharing of resources/expertise amongst transnational partners?	90,0	93,3	86,3
19.	The extent to which technology and other resources are used effectively and innovatively?	85,0	85,0	90,0
20.	The link between project workplan and cost-effective use of	91,7	93,3	92,5







Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

INTERNAL EVALUATIONS OF INVENT PROJECT				
(Percentage of satisfaction)				
	How do you evaluate...	1 st internal evaluation	2 nd internal evaluation	3 rd internal evaluation
	resources?			

6 Conclusions

All questions, included in the questionnaire scored, in all three (3) internal evaluations, above the acceptance limit of 75% satisfaction, which means that no corrective action had to be taken.

7 Annexes







Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

Annex I : QF-PQA(1.0):Project Quality Assessment Questionnaire

Date of Assessment:

Assessment made by: Organization/name

Answer each question with an evaluation from 1-5, where 1 is Poor and 5 is Very Good

Performance Indicators/Issues to be addressed		1	2	3	4	5
How do you evaluate....						
1.	The extent to which the consortium commits time and resources as required by the Work Plan?					
2.	The consortium's efficiency to resolve problems?					
3.	The effectiveness and clarity of the communication among the partners and the Project Coordinator?					
4.	The effectiveness and clarity of communication with other agencies eg. the National Agency, EEA Grants Managing Authority?					
5.	The commitment and proportionate involvement of all partners?					
6.	The arrangements for the implementation of the work packages and the administration of budgets?					
7.	The effectiveness of the project co-ordination?					
8.	The professional competence and commitment displayed by the PC?					
9.	The quality of the relationship among the partners and team-development?					







Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

Performance Indicators/Issues to be addressed		1	2	3	4	5
10.	The quality of the project monitoring and evaluation processes?					
11.	The quality of the project information/results dissemination arrangements?					
12.	The adherence to the Work Plan by all partners?					
13.	The deviations from the Work Plan? If any, were they based on well-considered reasons and mutual agreement?					
14.	The quality of the project in terms of its short, medium and long term impact at local/regional/national/European level?					
15.	The quality of materials/guides/reports/products throughout the life-cycle of the project?					
16.	The support from within your partner organization, in terms of managerial support, specialized support or peer support?					
17.	The sufficiency, range and suitability of project resources, including, where appropriate, technology resources?					
18.	The sharing of resources/expertise amongst transnational partners?					
19.	The extent to which technology and other resources are used effectively and innovatively?					
20.	The link between project workplan and cost-effective use of resources?					

